

FILED
MAR 28 1921

JAMES D. NAHER
CLERK

IN THE
SUPREME COURT
OF THE
UNITED STATES.

October Term, 1920.

No. ~~5000~~

Kern River Company, Pacific Light
and Power Corporation, and South-
ern California Edison Company,
Appellants,

vs.

The United States of America.

BRIEF OF APPELLANTS.

JAMES A. GIBSON,
ROY V. REPPY,
Attorneys for Appellants.

HENRY F. PRINCE,
Of Counsel.

INDEX TO BRIEF OF APPELLANTS.

	PAGE
Statement of the Case.....	3
Specifications of Errors.....	14
Main Propositions Presented in Argument.....	16
Argument:	
1. The Stipulated Facts and Reasonable Inferences Therefrom Conclusively Establish That There Was No Fraud Perpetrated Upon the Department of Interior in Obtaining the Right of Way in Question.....	18
2. In the Absence of an Express Forfeiture Clause in the Act Under Which the Grant Was Obtained, or of Authority From Congress Declaring a Forfeiture, No Right to Sue for a Forfeiture Exists.....	50
3. The Suit Was Barred by the Statute of Limitations Contained in the Act Under Which the Grant Was Obtained.....	80
4. The Question of the Secretary of the Interior Having Exceeded His Authority in Approving the Grant Was Not Raised by the Bill and Therefore Was Not and Is Not an Issue in the Case	95
5. The Learned Circuit Court of Appeals in Reversing the Decree of the District Court Erred in Making Unwarranted Assumptions of Fact and Erred as to the Law Applicable Thereto	99
6. In the Absence of a Right of Forfeiture of Appellant's Right of Way, an Injunction Against Its Further Use, Accomplishing Substantially a Forfeiture, Is Unwarranted.....	109
7. The Development of Power to Be Sold to the Public Comes Fully Within the Terms "Purposes of a Public Nature" Contained in Sec. 2 of the Act of May 11, 1898.....	110
Conclusion	115
Appendix: Reprint of United States Statutes Involved	118

TABLE OF CASES CITED.

	PAGE
Beley v. Naphtaly, 169 U. S. 353, 18 Sup. Ct. Rep. 354, 42 L. Ed. 775.....	57
Chicago G. W. Ry. Co. v. Minn. Ry., 176 Fed. 237, 244	19
Farrar v. Churchill, 135 U. S. 609, 10 Sup. Ct. Rep. 771, 34 L. Ed. 246.....	38
Halsell v. Renfrow, 202 U. S. 287, 26 Sup. Ct. Rep. 610, 50 L. Ed. 1032.....	19
Jones v. Simpson, 116 U. S. 609, 6 Sup. Ct. Rep. 538, 29 Law Ed. 742.....	38
Louisiana v. Garfield, 211 U. S. 70, 53 L. Ed. 70..	90
Moffatt v. United States, 112 U. S. 24, 5 Sup. Ct. Rep. 10, 28 L. Ed. 623.....	46
Moore v. Robbins, 96 U. S. 530, 24 L. Ed. 848....	56
Mt. Vernon-Woodberry Cotton Duck Co. v. Alabama Co., 240 U. S. 30, 60 Law Ed. 507.....	110
Nichols v. Commonwealth (Ky.), 64 S. W. 448...	89
Noble v. Union River Logging Co., 147 U. S. 165, 13 Sup. Ct. Rep. 271, 37 L. Ed. 123.....	54, 104
Northern Pac. R. Co. v. United States, 227 U. S. 355, 57 L. Ed. 544.....	92, 93
Peterson v. Jenks, 2 Peters 216, 7 L. Ed. 402....	39
Schulenberg v. Harriman, 21 Wall. 44, 22 L. Ed. 551	69, 71
State v. Horman, 50 S. E. 828, 830.....	89
Union Land & Stock Co. v. United States, 257 Fed. 635	74
United States v. Arrendonda, 6 Peters 691, 8 L. Ed. 547	39
United States v. Chandler Dunbar Water Power Co., 209 U. S. 446, 52 Law Ed. 881.....	82, 84

	PAGE
United States v. Iron Silver Mining Co., 128 U. S. 673, 9 Sup. Ct. Rep. 195, 32 L. Ed. 571.....	40
United States v. La Roque, 239 U. S. 62 (see p. 68), 60 L. Ed. 147.....	92
United States v. Morris, 222 Fed. 14.....	86
United States v. Northern Pac. etc. Co., 177 U. S. 435, 20 Sup. Ct. Rep. 706, 44 L. Ed. 836.....	63
United States v. Oregon & C. R. Co., 186 Fed. 861.	75
United States v. Poland, 251 U. S. 221.....	105
United States v. Safe Investment Gold Mining Co., 258 Fed. 872.....	33, 47, 96
United States v. Stone, 2 Wall. 525, 17 L. Ed. 765.	89
United States v. Stinson, 197 U. S. 200, 49 Law Ed. 724, 25 Sup. Ct. Rep. 426.....	44, 48
United States v. Tenn. & C. R. Co., 71 Fed. 71....	69
United States v. The Puget Sound Traction etc. Co., 215 Fed. 436.....	86
United States v. Utah Power & Light Co., 243 U. S. 389, 37 Sup. Ct. Rep. 387, 61 Law Ed. 791...	71
United States v. Washington Improvement & De- velop. Co., 189 Fed. 674.....	60, 66, 72
United States v. Whitney, 176 Fed. 593.....	67
United States v. Winona & St. Peter Ry. Co., 165 U. S. 463, 17 Sup. Ct. Rep. 368, 41 L. Ed. 789	87, 88
Walker v. Shasta Power Co., 160 Fed. 856.....	111
Wall v. Parrot Silver & Copper Co., 244 U. S. 407, 37 Sup. Ct. Rep. 609, 61 Law Ed. 1229.....	33, 97
Wood v. Carpenter, 101 U. S. 135, 25 L. Ed. 807	91, 92